

BEST COPY
Available

August 4, 1965

This would be a matter which might properly be characterized as a political matter except that the time Dr. Santillano spent here as a student exchange visitor has not counted toward the 4 years of time required for naturalization purposes. Dr. Santillano has in fact spent over 5 years in this country, yet has several more years to go before he can complete the requirements of the law and practice medicine.

It is for this reason that I am introducing a bill which would have the effect of holding that the time he spent in this country as an exchange student will be considered in compliance with section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as it relates to residence and physical presence.

Fred D. Goodell
FRED D. GOODELL
PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S RECENT
ATTACK ON HOUSE REPUBLICAN
LEADER JERRY FORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Marquand). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOODELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to resue and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my dismay and deep concern over President Johnson's recent attack on House Republican Leader Jerry Ford.

This has serious implications far beyond the fact that the President was exhibiting unbecoming pride. It is apparent from the reports of all newspaper people directly involved in Mr. Ford's background briefing last Thursday that the President's version of what happened was completely in error. Jerry Ford distorted nothing and he revealed no confidence of the President or anybody else.

The really vicious issue revolves around the purpose to be served by White House briefings of congressional leaders. Obviously, no responsible leader breaks secret or confidential material involving the national security. That has not been charged here nor is it involved in any way. Apparently the so-called confidential information that irritated the President so much was that many members of the President's own party question a firm policy against aggression in southeast Asia. Is the President really so sensitive to criticism, so thin skinned, if you will, that he thinks there should be an embargo on this kind of background news just because some aspects of it were revealed at a White House briefing? If this is the President's interpretation, he will make it impossible for Republican congressional leaders to attend such briefings at the White House. We cannot and will not abdicate our responsibility of applying independent judgment to critical national issues and giving the press and the American people all the facts on matters outside security limitations.

Is the President really contending that the revolt within his own party, particularly within the other body, is confidential? Is it really malicious for Re-

publican leaders to point out that the President is under considerable pressure from members of his own party to cut and run in southeast Asia? We Republicans in the House are proud of our leader, Jerry Ford. Unlike many members of the President's own party, we will continue to support a policy of firmness against Communist aggression. We will also continue to make critical, constructive suggestions, whether the President likes it or not. This is our obligation to the people who elected us and to the American people as a whole.

Perhaps the President underestimate the reaction of anger, indignation and resentment among House Republicans as a result of his rather intemperate and less than coherent criticism of Mr. Ford last Sunday. I hope not, because repetition of this kind of ridiculous episode might do little for the bipartisan support and bipartisan contribution the President and the country so urgently require in times of national crisis.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the Record the very thorough and complete report by one of our most eminent Washington correspondents, Mr. Tom Wicker. Mr. Wicker participated in the background briefing by Mr. Ford that subsequently came under attack by the President. His report appeared in the August 3 issue of the New York Times, and follows:

MINNESOTA'S FORD SAYS IN STORY TO
JOURNALISTS

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, August 3.—Representative ORLAND W. FOLSOM, House minority leader, said today that President Johnson's criticism of one of the prominent members of the Republican Party was the possible result of a misunderstanding.

Mr. Folsom was suggested as the President's target in a number of newspaper articles today, though Mr. Johnson maintained he was by name.

The President said yesterday that the unnamed Republican had broken and shattered his confidence after attending a White House meeting of congressional leaders last Tuesday night. At that session, Mr. Johnson discussed with the leaders the situation in South Vietnam.

Today, Mr. Folsom stated that he failed to be baited into a verbal confrontation with the Committee in Charge that would fall into the hands of Hanoi, Peking and Moscow.

If Mr. Johnson was referring to him, he said, there was a "misunderstanding" which I trust the White House will correct."

At Austin, Tex., in a news conference held before Mr. Folsom spoke out, Joseph Laitin, the assistant White House press secretary, said there would be no further comment. The President, he said, "never gets into personalities of any kind" (laughter is recorded at this point on the news conference transcript) and that is that."

He said the President had answered a fair question that had referred to stories he read in the newspapers which didn't give a source, and the President felt that it was a distortion and was inaccurate.

After Mr. Folsom's statement, Mr. Laitin said at a second news conference: "I've said all I'm going to say this morning. The White House isn't interested in controversy."

There was no suggestion that there had been any direct conversation between Mr. Folsom and Mr. Johnson.

Here is an account, based on the pub-

lished record, and on the notes and memories of those present, of how the controversy arose:

One Tuesday, Mr. Johnson invited a number of congressional leaders, including Mr. Folsom, to the White House for a discussion of developments among administration officials on the war in Vietnam.

SOME SUSPENSE BY DECISION

On Wednesday, in a Presidential news conference, Mr. Johnson announced that he would gradually double draft calls to 45,000 men and send 50,000 additional troops to Vietnam. That surprised those who had predicted that he would call up the reserves to declare a national emergency, and on Thursday, Mr. Folsom and Representative ANDREW M. LAZARUS, the chairman of the House Republican conference, met for lunch with a small group of reporters. It was one of a regular series of meetings they hold, and invitations had been issued at least a week earlier.

Mr. Folsom and Mr. Lazarus deferred most of their remarks to their own views on Vietnam, including the statement that they would urge the President and other Members of Congress to cut back on domestic expenditures in order to meet the growing expenses of the Vietnamese war.

Both explicitly stated that they would not criticize the President for his course in Vietnam until there had been time to see whether the troop buildup had been effective. The two Republican leaders had previously been urging intensified air-and-sea attacks on North Vietnam rather than emphasis on the ground warfare.

SENATOR MANFIELD STATEMENT

During the session with reporters, Mr. Folsom said that at the White House meeting Tuesday night Senator MICHAEL MANFIELD, of Maine, the Senate Democratic leader, had read a two-page statement in which he expressed fears about the stability of the South Vietnamese Government, the danger of continuing the war, and the possibility of a prolonging the debate in the Senate on the Vietnamese question.

That is the extent of the substance of the testimony that Mr. Folsom gave. The rest of the disclosure was Mr. Folsom's desire not to be attributed to Mr. Manfield, although most of the session was off the record.

On Friday morning, at least three reports of the Manfield statement were published. The New York Times referred to it as it had been described by Mr. Folsom. In its article that said the attitude of the Senate had been "soft," in Mr. Johnson's attempt to call up Reserves or decide a national emergency.

The Chicago Tribune mentioned the Manfield statement again, adding that Mr. Folsom, in his description, had implied that Senator Manfield had

President Johnson, in an 11th-hour decision Tuesday, canceled plans to declare a state of emergency, call up the Reserves, and ask Congress for \$5 billion to expand the war in Vietnam, congressional sources said today.

The article, written by Willard Edwards, said Mr. Johnson had done so when warned by Senate Democratic leaders that the more dramatic plans would cause a "tremendous congressional and public reaction."

The syndicated columnists Robert Novak and Rowland Evans also referred to the Manfield statement in an article in the New York Herald Tribune and other newspapers. They described it as having expressed the Senator's opposition to "almost everything the United States has done in Vietnam since the murder of President Diem in 1963," and said that he also implied that this sentiment was felt widely in the Senate.

The columnists, neither of whom had attended the Ford-Laird luncheon, said the